



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/042,696	10/03/2001	Taffy Williams	07206-0021 (MCP-0082)	3964
22852	7590	05/26/2004	EXAMINER	
FINNEMAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP 1300 I STREET, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20005			LIU, SAMUEL W	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1653		

DATE MAILED: 05/26/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/042,696	WILLIAMS ET AL.
	Examiner Samuel W Liu	Art Unit 1653

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.      2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) NONE is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) 1-14 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-5 and 11, drawn to a retroinverso polypeptide peptide and a conjugated polypeptide comprising said polypeptide linked to biopolymer (e.g., dextran) for delivery, are classified in class 530, subclasses 300, and class 514, subclass 2<sup>+</sup>.
- II. Claims 6-7, drawn to a drug conjugate comprising a chemotherapeutic drug and the peptide, are classified in class 530, subclasses 300 and 402, and class 514, subclass 2<sup>+</sup>.
- III. Claim 8, drawn to a radioisotope conjugate comprising a radioisotope and the peptide, is classified in class 423, subclass 249, and class 530, subclasses 300 and 402.
- IV. Claims 9-10, drawn to a drug conjugate comprising a cytotoxic agent (e.g., ricin) and the peptide, are classified in class 530, subclasses 300 and 402, and class 514, subclass 2<sup>+</sup>.
- V. Claims 12-24, drawn to a method of inhibiting metastasis, invasion and adhesion of tumor cell comprising administering to a subject the polypeptide of Group I, are classified in class 514, subclass 2<sup>+</sup>, and class 530, subclasses 300 and 402.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I, II, III and IV products are structurally distinct from one another. The products of Invention II, III and IV are structurally distinct/different conjugates, e.g., chemotherapeutic drug (e.g., doxorubicin – an anthracycline antibiotics) of Invention II; radioisotope of Invention III; and cytotoxic agent (e.g., ricin – a toxic glycoprotein), while the product of Invention I is not the conjugated polypeptide, i.e., not a chemically modified or polymer-modified polypeptide. The biopolymers of each invention would be expected to exhibit different physical and chemical properties, and are capable of separate manufacture or use.

Invention I and Invention V are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case, the peptide can be used in surface plasma resonance technique in which the protein is immobilized on the chip-gold surface in order to detecting real time protein-protein interaction.

Invention II and Invention V are related as product and process of use since the chemotherapeutic drug is used for treating tumor. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case, the peptide can be used in surface plasma resonance technique in which the protein is immobilized on the chip-gold surface in order to detecting real time protein-protein interaction.

Invention III and Invention V are related as product and process of use since the radioisotope-labeled polypeptide can also be used for treating tumor cell. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case, the peptide can be used for raising an antibody that recognizes the polypeptide, for example.

Invention IV and Invention V are also related as product and process of use (it is noted that abrin of group IV has some potential medical uses, such as in treatment to kill cancer cells). The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case, the peptide can be used for raising an antibody that recognizes the polypeptide, for example.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and since they have acquired a separate status in the art shown by their different classification and/or divergent

subject matter, and/or are separately and independently searched, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. **Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier.** Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See “Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai, In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b),” 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.**

Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Samuel Wei Liu, Ph.D. whose telephone number is (571) 272-0949. The examiner can normally be reached Monday-Friday 9:00 -5:30. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dr. Christopher Low can be reached on (571) 272-0951. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-4242 for regular communication and (703) 305-3014 for the after final communication.

  
Samuel W. Liu, Ph.D.

May 19, 2004

  
Karen Cochrane Carlson, Ph.D.

KAREN COCHRANE CARLSON, PH.D  
PRIMARY EXAMINER